

REMARKS

Objections to the Specification:

Applicants have amended the specification as suggested by the Examiner.

Rejection of the Claims under 35 USC § 112:

Claims 1, 18, 20, 29 and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite with respect to the term "compound". Applicants have amended the claims to obviate the rejection. Specifically, Applicants have amended claims 1, 29 and 30 to incorporate the limitations of claims 2, 4 and 8, which the examiner indicated as having allowable subject matter.

Claim 1, 29 and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite with respect to the method of attachment. Applicants have amended the claims to incorporate the limitation of claim 18: covalently attachment. Claim 18 has been canceled.

Claim 21 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite with respect to the term "PEG". Applicants have amended the claim to cite the term "polyethylene glycol" instead of the abbreviation as recommended by the Examiner.

Claims 29 and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for not reasonably providing enablement for a composition comprising any compound targeted to hepatocytes in vivo with a T7 ligand. Applicants have amended the claims to obviate the rejection.

Specifically, Applicants have amended the claims to incorporate the limitations of claims 2, 4 and 8. Support for delivery of a drug to hepatocytes is supported by delivery of yellow fluorescent protein in example 4 on page 27, streptavidin in examples 7 and 8 starting on page 28, and interferon in example 5 starting on page 27. Support for delivery of a complex to hepatocytes is supported by delivery of dextran-streptavidin complexes in example 8 starting on page 30. Support for delivery of a polynucleotide to hepatocytes is supported by delivery of siRNA in example 8 starting on page 30.